UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,607	01/14/2002	Andrew C. Gilbert	01-1034 CF/34	5741
63710 INNOVATION	7590 02/16/201 DIVISION	EXAMINER		
CANTOR FITZ	GERALD, L.P.	TINKLER, MURIEL S		
NEW YORK, N	H STREET (6TH FLO NY 10022	OK)	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3691	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/16/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/047,607	GILBERT ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	MURIEL TINKLER	3691
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
<ol> <li>Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 D</u></li> <li>This action is <b>FINAL</b>. 2b) ☐ This</li> <li>Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E</li> </ol>	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, p	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-41</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-41</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Stion is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applic rity documents have been rece u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ived in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	Date

Art Unit: 3691

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

This application has been reviewed. Claims 1-41 are pending. The rejection(s) are as follows.

## Response to Amendment

1. The amendments have been reviewed against the specification and accepted for examination.

### Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 6, 7, 14, 15 and 17-41 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Examiner now points to the particular parts of claims 6 and 14 that are not supported by the specification. See the 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejection below.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 4. Claims 1-7, 9-15 and 17-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably

convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

- 5. Claims 6 and 14 disclose the limitation: "electronically determining the presentation of the first and second passive orders to a prospective aggressor counterparty, a difference between the determined presentation of the two passive orders to the prospective aggressor counterparty indicating to the prospective aggressor counterparty the respective principal and broker authorities of the two respective passive orders." The Examiner has read through the specification again and could not find any indication of any "determination" function for presenting the first and second passive orders to a prospective counterparty. It is unclear if this "determination" changes the way the passive orders "normally" appear and it is also unclear what the purpose is for determining the presentation of the first and second passive orders.

  Dependent claims 1-5, 7, 9-15 and 17-41 do not cure this deficiency and are therefore also rejected.
- 6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

  The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 7. Claims 6, 7, 14, 15 and 17-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 8. Claims 6 and 14 recite the following limitation: "electronically determining the presentation of the first and second passive orders to a prospective aggressor

Art Unit: 3691

counterparty, a difference between the determined presentation of the two passive orders to the prospective aggressor counterparty indicating to the prospective aggressor counterparty the respective principal and broker authorities of the two respective passive orders." The separator (",") within this limitation renders it somewhat confusing. More specifically, the phrase that starts with "a difference between the determined presentation of the two passive orders..." does not have a connector phrase/word to the first part of the limitation. This lack of connector phrase renders the second part of the limitation confusing. Without the connector phrase within the limitation, the second part of the phrase can be interpreted several ways, here are a few: "presentation" of the orders shows the aggressor who is the principal and broker—in other words, the ordering or position of the orders indicates who is the principal and who is the broker; the difference (or change) in the passive orders discloses who the principal and broker are—the only change is an indication or wording discloses a principal and a broker; changing the original presentation to indicate a principal and a broker, in the above mentioned ways.

9. Dependent claims 1-5, 7, 9-15 and 17-41 do not cure this deficiency and are therefore also rejected.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/047,607

Art Unit: 3691

Page 5

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 11. Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silverman '583 and Silverman et al. (US 5,136,501 A) hereafter referred to as Silverman '501.
- 12. Claims 8 and 16 discuss a system and method for trading, comprising: trader; receiving a trading command from a first determining whether the first trader is acting as a broker; trader; and presenting the trading command to a second preventing the second trader from acting on the trading command when the first trader is acting as a broker so that the trading command does not form part of the trade and blocking the completion of the transaction. Silverman '583 discloses the information in Claims 3-5, 8 and 11-13. Additionally, Specifically Silverman '583 discloses: the use of a broker in column 1 (lines 20-26); the use of a principle workstation or trading booth in column 1 (lines 27-40); sending and receiving passive trading commands in figure 1; displaying passive trading commands using use tabs in column 4 (lines 11-42); and, displaying the first and second passive commands in a different manner in the Summary of the Invention in column 2 (lines 25-53).
- 13. Silverman '583 does not disclose the act of placing different limitations on principal and broker (i.e. preventing certain traders from acting on a trade). Silverman '501 teaches the art of preventing a trader from acting on a trade in the Abstract, column 3 (lines 18-38), column 4 (line 27) through column 5 (line 35) and column 17 (line 59) through column 18 (line 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person

Art Unit: 3691

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Silverman '583 to gain the ability to block trade because, according to Silverman '501 in Disclosure of the Invention, to controllably mask the available trading market and efficiently transmit only the required matching information to those key stations which require it.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MURIEL TINKLER whose telephone number is (571)272-7976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8 AM until 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571)272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3691

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Muriel Tinkler/ Examiner, Art Unit 3691